

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed February 9, 2007. Claims 1-34 are pending in the subject application. Claims 9-29 are allowed. Claims 1, 19-21, 23-26 and 28-30 have been amended. Support for all amended claims can be found in the specification, and no new matter has been added by these amendments. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8 and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Specifically, claims 1-8 and 30-34 were rejected because, as stated in the Office Action, "a method for detecting a boundary between two bytes X1 and X2 in a deserialized data stream, the data stream comprising N consecutive X1 bytes followed by N consecutive X2 bytes" and "a method of processing data in a SONET frame" are abstract ideas and are not directed to a practical application. The Office Action further states that the claims do not produce useful concrete and tangible results.

While Applicants' regard claims 1-8 and 30-34 as being directed to a practical application that produce useful concrete and tangible results in their present form, Applicants hereby amend claims 1 and 30 to expedite prosecution of this application.

In particular, Applicants hereby amend claim 1 to recite in part "aligning the data stream along the detected X1X2 boundary to an extent to which the X1X2 boundary is byte shifted from an end point of the data stream such that said first M bytes are on one side of the X1X2 boundary and said second M bytes are on an opposite side of the X1X2 boundary." Applicants also amend claim 30 to recite in part "detecting a A1A2 boundary in the SONET frame; determining the extent to which the A1A2 boundary is shifted with respect to an end position of the data stream; and shifting the A1 and A2 bytes with respect to the extent to which the A1A2 boundary is shifted to align N consecutive bytes along the A1A2 boundary in the SONET frame."

Applicants believe that claims 1 and 30, as amended, are directed to a practical application that produce useful concrete and tangible results. Specifically, data is aligned with a boundary such that the last bit of a data segment occurs on a data bus for a given clock cycle and the first bit of a next data segment occurs on the data bus during the next clock cycle. Thus, the data is aligned along the boundary in a minimum number of clock cycles with a minimum of logic circuitry. For at least this reason, claims 1 and 30 are allowable, as are claims 2-8 and 31-34, which depend from claims 1 and 30, respectively.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8 and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 206-467-9600.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

4/10/07


John J. Farrell
Reg. No. 57,291

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
206-467-9600 Telephone
415-576-0300 Facsimile

JJF:clm

60994267 v1